TDCOSMO: XX. WFI2033–4723, the First Quadruply-Imaged Quasar Modeled with JWST Imaging

D. M. Williams^{*,1}, T. Treu¹, S. Birrer², A. J. Shajib^{**,3}, K. C. Wong⁴, T. Morishita⁵, T. Schmidt¹, and M. Stiavelli⁶

¹ Department of Physics and Astronomy, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA

² Department of Physics and Astronomy, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794, USA

³ Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637, USA

⁴ Research Center for the Early Universe, Graduate School of Science, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

⁵ IPAC, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

⁶ Space Telescope Science Institute, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA

Received 00 Month 0000; accepted 00 Month 0000

ABSTRACT

Gravitational time delays offer unique, independent measurements of the Hubble constant, H_0 . Precise measurements of H_0 stand as one of the most pressing challenges in modern cosmology, and to do so with time delays requires precise lens models. While much work has focused on streamlining the modeling process to keep pace with the erumpent discovery of strongly-lensed systems, a critical step toward reducing uncertainty in H_0 comes from increasing the precision of individual lens models themselves. In this work, we demonstrate that the unprecedented imaging capabilities of JWST make this goal attainable. We present the first lens model for time-delay cosmography derived from JWST data, applied to the quadruply-imaged quasar WFI2033–4723. While the primary source of systematic uncertainty in time-delay cosmography overall is currently the mass-sheet degeneracy (MSD), the sensitivity of models to this MSD varies depending how the point spread function (PSF) errors are mitigated. As the PSF is also the primary source of uncertainty in lens modeling, we focus on a comparison of different PSF modeling methods. Within the context of power-law models, we recover results in agreement with previous Hubble Space Telescope (HST)-based models, but with better precision of key lensing parameters through implementation of new PSF modeling techniques. Despite the record-holding precision of this system's HST modeling, we achieve an additional 22% increase in precision of the Fermat potential difference, directly reducing uncertainties of cosmological inference. These results would produce a 3% (1 σ of the lens modeling error) shift of H₀ towards a higher value for this lens, if one were to keep all else constant. This work substantiates the groundbreaking potential of JWST for time-delay cosmography and lays the groundwork for modeling systems previously too faint to provide meaningful constraints on H₀.

Key words. Gravitational lensing: strong - Methods: data analysis, statistical - Galaxies: active, distances and redshifts - cosmological parameters - distance scale

1 Introduction

The expansion rate of the universe remains one of the most hotly debated topics in cosmology after two decades of measurements with improving statistical precision. Measurements of the early universe, extrapolating to what the current value of the expansion rate should be given today's standard cosmological model Λ CDM, give values in tension with direct measurements of the late universe. Hope that the tension would dissolve in time is proving to be misplaced—as the precision of both the early- and late-universe measurements have increased, so too has their tension. For a more comprehensive review, see, e.g. Verde et al. (2019); Shah et al. (2021); Abdalla et al. (2022).

The confirmation of the "Hubble tension" would have profound implications for cosmology, requiring adjustments to or even a complete revision of the standard model (Knox & Millea 2020; Efstathiou 2021, e.g.). Considerable effort has been spent evaluating sources of systematic uncertainties in both methods, none proving successful (Riess et al. 2019, 2021, 2022; Freedman et al. 2019, 2020; Dainotti et al. 2021; Mortsell et al. 2022). It is clear that multiple independent methods with comparable precision will be needed to achieve a final verdict on residual systematics error and settle the Hubble tension once and for all.

One such method is time-delay cosmography, first discussed in Refsdal (1964) (for recent reviews, see, e.g. Treu & Marshall 2016; Treu et al. 2022). It provides a one-step measurement of H_0 , *independent* of methods that rely on the local distance ladder for late-universe measurements or on sound horizon physics, such as CMB measurements, for early-universe measurements (e.g., Vanderriest et al. 1989; Keeton & Kochanek 1997; Oguri 2007; Suyu & Halkola 2010). In this work, we focus on time-delay cosmography applied to lensed quasars. Quadruply-imaged quasars (hereafter quads), where light from a quasar is bent around a lensing galaxy to produce four distinct images, provide three independent measurements of the expansion rate along with tight constraints on the lensing galaxy's mass distribution.

Until the last decade, the precision of time-delay cosmography was limited by the small number of known systems, and further by the number of those systems with reliable time delays measured. Fortunately, there has been an explosion of newly discovered strong lenses, resulting in a commensurate effort to gather the necessary ancillary data and to quicken the lens modeling process. Key advances include: systematic time-delay mea-

^{*} e-mail: devon@astro.ucla.edu

^{**} NHFP Einstein Fellow

surements (spearheaded by the COSMOGRAIL project: e.g., Millon et al. 2020; Bonvin et al. 2019), automated modeling techniques (e.g., Shajib et al. 2019; Schmidt et al. 2022), consistent analyses of lens environments (e.g., Wells et al. 2024b), and improved kinematic constraints (e.g., Tan et al. 2024). Unfortunately, ground-based seeing-limited images cannot be modeled to the precision required for cosmography. The Hubble Space Telescope (HST), with its stable PSF, has been the main workhorse for these kinds of models (e.g., Suyu et al. 2010a; Birrer et al. 2019), even though some breakthroughs have been achieved in the use of adaptive optics assisted data (e.g., Chen et al. 2019).

In this context, JWST plays multiple important roles: first, it holds the potential to further improve the precision of lens models; second, it provides an entirely new means of verifying systematics in previous models that are based on other telescope data (namely HST); third, with its superior resolution and sensitivity it will be crucial to exploit the large number of systems about to be discovered, which will likely be fainter than the ones analyzed so far (Oguri & Marshall 2010); and fourth, the extended wavelength range will enhance the detection of the extended emission (arcs) from the quasar host galaxy, providing tighter constraints on the deflector's mass distribution.



Fig. 1. JWST NIRCam color image of WFI2033-4723 (GTO Program #1198; PI: Stiavelli). The F115W band is mapped to the luminosity and blue, F150W to cyan, F277W to yellow, and the F356W band to red. Near the bottom image, there is a bright spot on the lower-right side that maps back to other bluer regions of the ring, indicating it is a multiply-imaged star-forming region (SFR) contained in the $z \sim 1.6$ host. Preliminary models place the physical size at ~150pc located ~2kpc from the center of the galaxy (assuming flat CDM cosmology with h = 0.7 and m = 0.3).

In this paper, we present the first JWST-based quadruplyimaged quasar lens model for cosmology. We focus on the lens system WFI2033–4723, discovered by Morgan et al. (2004) and previously modeled based on HST data (Rusu et al. 2020). This system is particularly interesting as the lensed host galaxy is detected by both HST and JWST, but only clearly resolved by JWST, as shown in Fig. 2. The figure also illustrates the complexity of JWST's PSF, which represents a major challenge of this work. Further, the system is fairly complex, having a satellite and multiple nearby galaxy perturbers with non-negligible impact on the lens models (and so require explicit modeling) (Sluse et al. 2019; Rusu et al. 2020). The goals of this paper are thus:

- 1. To verify whether the HST and JWST models agree for this system, justifying our handling of systematic effects in the HST models
- 2. To quantify the improvements in precision that JWST provides for lens modeling
- 3. To demonstrate sufficient handling of the PSF to facilitate these improvements
- 4. To determine if the superior angular resolution and improved extended-emission/arc detection of JWST yields improved constraints on nearby perturbers

As the goal of this paper is to make a direct comparison of strong lens modeling based on HST and JWST, we limit ourselves to the core analysis without performing a full determination of the Hubble constant from this study. While this work can be used for such a study, the full analysis will be performed in a proceeding paper. Among the simplifications, we work within the context of a power-law model and do not consider the mass sheet degeneracy. We also do not consider updates to the external convergence estimates that have been implemented by our collaboration since the Rusu et al. (2020) analysis. These choices make it more straightforward to perform a direct comparison with Rusu et al. (2020). For these reasons, we compare our results in terms of Fermat potential differences between the images with the longest expected time delay $\Delta \tau_{BC}$ (for brevity, we will refer to this quantity as "the Fermat potential" in the text). This is the quantity more directly connected to the lens model and yet close enough to H_0 to permit an intuitive understanding of our results: all other things being equal, this quantity is directly proportional to H_0 . However, we stress that all other things are not equal, since other factors contribute to H_0 , for example the external convergence, determination of the MSD parameter from the velocity dispersion, and the other time delays of the quad. Therefore, our result should not be taken out of context and plugged into the analysis of Rusu et al. (2020) directly to update their measurement of H_0 .

An important difference with respect to the previous analysis is that we use a different strong lensing code: Rusu et al. (2020) used GLEE (Suyu & Halkola 2010), while we use LENSTRONOMY (Birrer & Amara 2018a; Birrer et al. 2021). The two codes have been tested extensively and compared directly (e.g., Shajib et al. 2022). The comparisons show that they give consistent results even though they differ in the way they parametrize important components, such as the host galaxy surface brightness distribution. When possible, we use the same parametrization as Rusu et al. (2020) to facilitate the comparison.

The main result of this paper is that JWST's PSF can be modeled with sufficient accuracy to enable the development of the next generation of lens models for time-delay cosmography. We show that JWST yields better precision than HST, and that the results agree within the statistical errors. We also show that with JWST's superior resolution and sensitivity, the mass distribution of the satellite galaxy is better constrained than with HST.

The paper is organized as follows. First, in Sect. 2 we outline the analysis steps. Then in Sect. 3 we present the data. In Sect. 4 we describe our PSF reconstruction methodology. In Sect. 5 we describe our modeling choices. In Sect. 6 we discuss how our models are combined in the final inference. In Sect. 7 we present our results and compare them with the previous HST model. In Sect. 8 we provide a brief summary.

When necessary we adopt a standard flat ACDM cosmology with $H_0 = 70 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, $\Omega_{,m}=0.3$, $\Omega_b = 0.05$, although we note that this choice is irrelevant from the point of view of the comparison presented here, since lens modeling is done in angular coordinates.

2 Outline of Analysis

The big-picture goal of this paper is to assess how advancements in space-based imaging quality impact the precision and accuracy of model-derived parameters. Specifically, we investigate how the transition from HST to JWST imaging influences the Fermat potential differences, $\Delta \tau$, which are crucial outputs for cosmographical inference of H_0 . To this end, we first review the lensing theory and discuss the observables in Sect. 2.1, review inherent degeneracies and systematic concerns of the analysis in Sect. 2.2 and how we address them in Sect. 2.3, and finish with the outline of our Bayesian analysis in Sect. 2.4.

2.1 Theory & Observables

This section will sprint through the theoretical groundwork for time-delay cosmography. For more of a stroll, we refer to recent reviews, e.g., Treu & Marshall (2016) or Suyu et al. (2018).

As light is deflected by gravitational fields, we can occasionally observe multiple rays of light traversing *different* paths yet originating from the *same* object. This special class of objects are dubbed "multiply-imaged". The combination of these two factors allows one to calculate distances at cosmological scales.

How our image is distorted is specified by the lens equation,

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\theta}),\tag{1}$$

with the lensed position in the lens plane ($\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$), position in the source plane ($\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2)$), and the deflection angle (α).

If we assume the deflection occurs in a single lens plane, we can quantify the observed delay between images with the *Fermat potential*,

$$\tau(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\beta}) \equiv \left[\frac{(\boldsymbol{\theta}-\boldsymbol{\beta})^2}{2} - \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right],\tag{2}$$

with the lens potential $(\psi(\theta))$. The Fermat potential is, up to an affine transformation, the light travel time along a ray starting at β , passing through θ in the lens plane, and arriving at the observer. The time required for light to reach the observer from one of these images is influenced by two factors. First is the spatial path length the light must traverse, and second is the gravitational potential the light experiences along that path (via the 'Shapiro delay' Shapiro 1964).

The lens potential $(\psi(\theta))$ is defined such that it solves two conditions. First, for the deflection angle

$$\alpha(\theta) = \nabla \psi(\theta), \tag{3}$$

and second, for the convergence (κ)

$$\kappa(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}). \tag{4}$$

The convergence is just the surface mass density in the image/lens plane at some pointing (Σ) scaled by the critical surface density of the universe, such that a pointing with 5% more than the cosmological average yields $\kappa = 1.05$. In other words,

$$\kappa \coloneqq \frac{\Sigma}{\Sigma_{\rm crit}},\tag{5}$$

with the critical density given by

$$\Sigma_{\rm crit} = \frac{c^2 D_{\rm s}}{4\pi G D_{\rm ds} D_{\rm d}}.$$
(6)

It is also related to the deflection potential, as $\nabla^2 \psi = 2\kappa$.

The difference in travel time for this lensed ray and an unlensed ray is given by the *excess time-delay*,

$$t(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{D_{\Delta t}}{c} \tau(\boldsymbol{\theta},\boldsymbol{\beta}), \tag{7}$$

where *c* is the speed of light and $D_{\Delta t}$ is the *time-delay distance* (Refsdal 1964, Schneider et al. 1992, Suyu et al. 2010b).

The time-delay distance is defined as

$$D_{\Delta t} \equiv (1+z_{\rm d}) \frac{D_{\rm d} D_{\rm s}}{D_{\rm ds}},\tag{8}$$

where z_d is the redshift of the deflector (lens) and D_d , D_s , and D_{ds} are the angular diameter distances to the deflector, source, and between the lens and source, respectively. The significance of the time-delay distance is that within each distance term lies an intrinsic H_0^{-1} . This leaves us

$$D_{\Delta t} \propto H_0^{-1}.\tag{9}$$

 $D_{\Delta t}$ has units of distance, and it has weak dependence on other cosmological parameters.

Now, we assume the background source and foreground deflector galaxy are sufficiently aligned such that multiple images are observed. As different images require light to travel different paths, their excess time-delays will differ. The *time-delay* between two images, say θ_i and θ_j , is thus the difference of their excess time-delays,

$$\Delta t_{ij} = \frac{D_{\Delta t}}{c} \left[\tau(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}) - \tau(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \right] = \frac{D_{\Delta t}}{c} \Delta \tau_{ij}.$$
 (10)

Therefore, constraints on the observed time-delay (Δt_{ij}) and the predicted Fermat potential difference $(\Delta \tau_{ij})$ can be converted into constraints on the time-delay distance $(D_{\Delta t})$, which is an inference on H_0 through Eq. (9).

If a source is variable on sufficiently short timescales, it is possible to measure a time-delay, Δt_{ij} , by extended monitoring of the image fluxes (e.g., Vanderriest et al. 1989; Schechter et al. 1997; Fassnacht et al. 1999, 2002; Kochanek et al. 2006; Courbin et al. 2011; Bonvin et al. 2019).

The Fermat potential difference, $\Delta \tau_{ij}$, requires three additional parameters for Eq. (2) (as θ_i and θ_j are simply the positions observed on the sky). Thankfully, neglecting MSD, the source position, β , and the lens potentials at the image positions, $\psi(\theta_i)$ and $\psi(\theta_j)$, can be determined by accurately modeling the mass of the system in imaging data; that data we denote by d_{JWST} . Then, with both Δt_{ij} and $\Delta \tau_{ij}$, Eq. (10) provides a measurement of $D_{\Delta t}$. With an assumption of a cosmological model, $D_{\Delta t}$ can be turned into an inference on H_0 .

Thus, the necessary ingredients for cosmographic inference of H_0 from strong lensing can be broken into four components. First is the modeling of imaging data, d_{JWST} , which is the focus of this paper. Second is the measured time-delays, Δt_{ij} , observed from combinations quasar's images (*i* and *j*). Third is the stellar kinematic information, σ^P , from spectroscopic data of our lens. The fourth, and final ingredient, is wide-field spectroscopy and imaging, d_{env} , providing environmental information. These are each discussed in part in Sect. 3.

2.2 Additional sources of error and degeneracies

2.2.1 Internal mass sheet degeneracy

Currently, the primary source of uncertainty in the Fermat potential—and time-delay cosmography at large—is the masssheet degeneracy (MSD) discussed in Falco et al. (1985) (more recently Wong et al. 2020, or Gilman et al. 2020 for substructure discussion, or Birrer et al. 2020 for environment discussion). In summary, by adding an infinite "sheet of mass" with constant uniform surface density, one can find the exact same image positions given a *different* source position, size, and luminosity, completely changing the physical geometry of the system and its associated Fermat potential.

While the time-delay (Δt_{ij}) is an observable, the relative Fermat potential $(\Delta \tau_{ij})$ is not. Instead, the Fermat potential is inferred from constraints on two particular features in the imaging data: the quasar image positions and the extended distortions in the lensed arcs. Consequently, the MSD allows degeneracy in our observed image positions to seep into our Fermat potential, thereby imposing limits on its precision and, via Eq. (9), on H_0 (e.g., Falco et al. 1985; Kochanek 2002; Saha & Williams 2006; Schneider & Sluse 2013, 2014; Birrer et al. 2016; Unruh et al. 2017; Birrer 2021).

As the MSD is inherent in the lens model (Saha 2000; Saha & Williams 2006), we first note that the MSD is a *mathematical* degeneracy as opposed to a physical degeneracy. More formally, the MSD is a multiplicative transform of the lens equation that yields the same image positions despite a linear source displacement and transformation of the convergence field, κ . In fewer words, but more Greek, we first displace the source by some scalar λ :

$$\beta \to \lambda \beta$$
, (11)

and transform the convergence field through:

$$\kappa(\theta) \to \lambda \kappa(\theta) + (1 - \lambda).$$
 (12)

Then, solving the lens equation with these quantities, we will find the image positions at:

$$\theta \to \theta.$$
 (13)

In other words, our direct observable in the imaging data—the image positions—would look the same despite moving the source and changing the convergence field. This is problematic, as the linear source displacement in Eq. (11) would yield a measurement of:

$$H_0 \to \lambda H_0. \tag{14}$$

This is currently the leading source of uncertainty in time-delay measurements of H_0 today, and it is broken with the non-lensing constraints on the mass distribution, namely stellar velocity dispersion Birrer et al. (2020); Shajib et al. (2023), or by constraints on the absolute luminosity of the source when it is known. As discussed in the introduction, this paper is concerned with information coming from the lens model itself, and therefore we can neglect the mass sheet transformation, keeping in mind that it needs to be considered when converting the inference from Fermat potential to H_0 .

2.2.2 Multiplane lensing

In addition, the observed time-delays will depend on any galaxy (or massive object) having a significant impact on the deflection of our source's light, and these need not be at the same redshift as our lens. In this generalized case, we must combine the angular diameter distances of the different lens planes, which is done with the multi-plane lens equation (e.g., Blandford & Narayan 1986; Kovner 1987; Schneider et al. 1992; Collett & Auger 2014; McCully et al. 2014). In our previous assumption, our time-delays were proportional to a single, unique time-delay distance. Under the multi-plane lens equation, this is no longer true. Thankfully, for quadruply-imaged quasars, it very often holds that the mass in a single plane dominates the lensing effect Suyu et al. (2020). This validates the single-lens approximation, as the observed time-delays are dominated by the time-delay distance (Eq. (8)) at the redshift of the lensing galaxy. This has also been found to be the case for this lens, WFI2033-4723 (Rusu et al. 2020). This single time-delay distance is referred to as the effective time-delay distance.

2.2.3 External convergence

An additional correction must be made to validate the singleplane approximation, addressing the lens potential that the light rays experience. We must take into account the additional focusing and defocusing that external mass causes, which modifies the measured time-delays (e.g., Seljak 1994). To avoid a biased inference of the time-delay distance, we apply a correction to our modeled value, $D_{\Delta t}^{\text{model}}$, to get the true $D_{\Delta t}$ with:

$$D_{\Delta t} = \frac{D_{\Delta t}^{\text{model}}}{1 - \kappa_{\text{ext}}}.$$
(15)

This is equivalent to adding (or removing) an external sheet of mass in the lens plane to account for the focusing (or defocusing) from the mass unaccounted for in the lens plane. This correction is valid for cases where the LOS (line-of-sight) perturbers are small enough to ignore the effect of higher-order terms (Keeton 2003; McCully et al. 2014). With Eq. (9), we note this correction yields a multiplicative factor of $(1 - \kappa_{ext})$ for inferences on H_0 .

Eq. (12), however, tells us that determining the value of κ_{ext} is generally impossible from the lens model alone due to the MSD. The approach typically taken includes estimating the mass along the LOS combined with the assumption that the deflector's mass profile drops to zero at large radii (e.g., Fassnacht et al. 2006; Momcheva et al. 2006, 2015; Williams et al. 2006; Wong et al. 2010; Wells et al. 2024b). Higher-order effects must be explicitly taken into account for perturbers that are extremely massive or particularly close to the lensing galaxy (McCully et al. 2017).

2.2.4 Mass density slope/time-delay degeneracy

An additional degeneracy exists between the lensing galaxy's radial mass slope and the time-delay distance (e.g., Kochanek 2002; Treu & Koopmans 2002; Wucknitz 2002), even within the context of power-law models. This degeneracy is broken in two ways. First, thanks to JWST, we have imaging of the extended arcs that are barely noticeable in HST data (see Fig. 2), whose modeling directly constrains the radial mass slope. Second, we also combine the lensing data with stellar kinematic data (e.g., Treu & Koopmans 2002; Koopmans et al. 2003; Auger et al. 2010; Suyu et al. 2014; Yıldırım et al. 2020).

2.3 Kinematics analysis

Stellar kinematics plays a crucial role in mitigating the effects of degeneracies (Treu & Koopmans 2002; Shajib et al. 2018, 2023; Knabel et al. 2024). With measurements of the stellar velocity dispersion, we can independently probe the 3D mass distribution of our deflector galaxy (after de-projecting from the observed convergence near the center of our lens, $\kappa_{obs, cen}$). I.e.,

$$\sigma \xrightarrow{\kappa_{\rm obs,\,cen}} \Phi(r) \to M,\tag{16}$$

where the observed convergence near the center of the deflector galaxy, $\kappa_{obs, cen}$, allows us to de-project the velocity dispersion, σ , to the gravitational potential, $\Phi(r)$.

To this end, we employ the spherical Jeans equation,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\left(l(r)\sigma_{\mathrm{r}}(r)^{2}\right)}{\mathrm{d}r} + \frac{2\beta_{\mathrm{ani}}(r)l(r)\sigma_{\mathrm{r}}(r)^{2}}{r} = -l(r)\frac{\mathrm{d}\Phi(r)}{\mathrm{d}r},\tag{17}$$

with the 3D luminosity density, l(r), the radial velocity dispersion, $\sigma_r(r)$, and the anisotropy parameter that relates σ_r to the tangential velocity dispersion σ_t . We define it as

$$\beta_{\text{ani}}(r) \coloneqq 1 - \frac{\sigma_{\text{t}}^2(r)}{\sigma_{\text{r}}^2(r)}.$$
(18)

The quantity we actually observe is the luminosity-weighted LOS velocity dispersion. We get this from the Jeans equation, as

$$\sigma_{\rm los}^2(R) = \frac{2G}{I(R)} \int_R^\infty \mathcal{K}_\beta\left(\frac{r}{R}\right) \frac{l(r)M(r)}{r} \mathrm{d}r,\tag{19}$$

with the gravitational constant, *G*, the surface brightness, I(R), and the enclosed 3D mass within a radius *r*, M(r) (Mamon & Lokas 2005). Our function, \mathcal{K}_{β} , depends on the parameterization of $\beta_{ani}(r)$. We adopt the Osipkov-Merritt parameterization, given by

$$\beta_{\rm ani}(r) = \frac{r^2}{r^2 + r_{\rm ani}^2},$$
 (20)

with the scaling radius, r_{ani} (Osipkov 1979; Merritt 1985a,b). This sets our function to

$$\mathcal{K}_{\beta}\left(u \coloneqq \frac{r}{R}\right) = \frac{u_{\text{ani}}^{2} + 1/2}{(u_{\text{ani}} + 1)^{3/2}} \left(\frac{u^{2} + u_{\text{ani}}^{2}}{u}\right) \tan^{-1} \left(\sqrt{\frac{u^{2} - 1}{u_{\text{ani}}^{2} + 1}}\right) - \frac{1/2}{u_{\text{ani}}^{2} + 1} \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{u^{2}}}, \quad (21)$$

with $u_{ani} := r_{ani}/R$ (Mamon & Lokas 2005). We can then find the observed aperture-averaged velocity dispersion via

$$\sigma_{\rm ap}^2 = \frac{\int_{\rm ap} \left[I(R) \sigma_{\rm los}^2(R) \right] * S \, \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y}{\int_{\rm ap} I(R) * S \, \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y},\tag{22}$$

where we integrate over the aperature, \int_{ap} , and convolve with the seeing, *S.

We note the external convergence will modify our modelpredicted velocity dispersion, $\sigma_{\rm ap, model}$ through

$$\sigma_{\rm ap, \, true}^2 = (1 - \kappa_{\rm ext})\sigma_{\rm ap, \, model}^2.$$
(23)

To correct for this effect, we sample κ_{ext} and weight our models by their ability to recover the observed velocity dispersion of the main deflector, $\sigma_{\text{obs, D}}$ (see Sect. 6.2).

We note full cosmographic analyses will also feature an additional degree of freedom in models with a λ term in this equation. As the purpose of this paper is to evaluate the improvements offered exclusively by imaging data, we focus our efforts on a direct *power-law* comparison, as imaging alone is unable to directly constrain the MSD.

2.4 Bayesian Analysis

To predict a time-delay under a given cosmology, the lens model infers the Fermat potential difference between two image pairs, which we define as $\Delta \tau$. We aim to describe $Pr(\Delta \tau \mid O)$, the conditional probability of the Fermat potential difference given our imaging and kinematic observables $O := \{O_{img}, O_{kin}\}$. We do not include the spectroscopic and photometric data used for the lens environment, as the external convergence inference can be accounted for with a separate, explicit prior, $Pr(\kappa_{ext})$.

For a full description of $Pr(\Delta \tau \mid O)$, we must first address the functional dependencies of the Fermat potential difference $\Delta \tau(\xi, \kappa_{ext})$. First is the external convergence κ_{ext} and second is our set of model parameters $\xi := {\xi_{lens}, \xi_{light}, r_{ani}}$. Given our observables, we can apply Bayes' theorem to rewrite

$$Pr(\xi, \kappa_{ext} \mid O)$$

$$\propto Pr(O \mid \xi, \kappa_{ext}) \times Pr(\xi, \kappa_{ext})$$

$$= \int_{2} Pr(O \mid \xi, \kappa_{ext}, S, D_{s/ds})$$

$$\times Pr(\xi, \kappa_{ext} \mid S) dS dD_{s/ds}.$$
(24)

We have introduced *S*, the set of hyper-parameters used by the lens model to describe O_{img} (e.g., the number of parameters describing the source, the set of pixels upon which the image likelihood is evaluated), and $D_{s/ds}$, which represents the distance ratio $D_{s/ds} := D_s/D_{ds}$. We then marginalize on these two parameters. We note a relatively recent change to this method of Bayesian analysis compared to similar works, where the external convergence is now (once again) independent of the model-predicted external shear (see Sect. 3.4). This splits the joint likelihood of κ_{ext} into its own prior. We also separate *O* into its two independent data components, rewriting Eq. (24) as

$$\int_{2} \Pr(O \mid \xi, \kappa_{\text{ext}}, S, D_{\text{s/ds}}) \\ \times \Pr(\xi \mid S) \times \Pr(\kappa_{\text{ext}}) \, \mathrm{d}S \, \mathrm{d}D_{\text{s/ds}} \\ = \int_{2} \Pr(O_{\text{img}} \mid \xi, S) \\ \times \Pr(O_{\text{kin}} \mid \xi, \kappa_{\text{ext}}, D_{\text{s/ds}}) \\ \times \Pr(\xi \mid S) \times \Pr(\kappa_{\text{ext}}) \, \mathrm{d}S \, \mathrm{d}D_{\text{s/ds}} \,.$$
(25)

Next, we convert the following sub-integral

$$\int \Pr(O_{\text{img}} | \xi, S) \Pr(\xi | S) \Pr(S) \, \mathrm{d}S$$
$$= \int \Pr(\xi | O_{\text{img}}, S) \Pr(O_{\text{img}} | S) \Pr(S) \, \mathrm{d}S \,. \tag{26}$$

This form is much more convenient, as sampling it gives us the model evidence, $Pr(O_{img} | S)$

Article number, page 5 of 23



Fig. 2. Comparison of the JWST data used in this analysis, NIRCam F115W, to the HST imaging, ACS/F814W. The ring structure is maximized in each visualization, as it provides the tightest constraints on the deflector's radial mass profile.

3 Data

As the focus of this paper is to explore the improvements that JWST imaging has to offer for cosmography-grade lens modeling, we use the same data products as the first cosmography model of this system (Rusu et al. 2020, hereafter HOLiCOW XII), replacing the HST imaging with that of JWST. First, we review the lens system WFI 2033–4723 (J2000: $20^{h}33^{m}41.9^{s}$, $-47^{\circ}23'43''.4$; hereafter WFI2033) in Sect. 3.1, followed by a discussion of the JWST NIRCam data used in Sect. 3.2. Next, we summarize the ancillary data, starting with the spectroscopic data used for measurements of velocity dispersions in Sect. 3.3. Finally, we go over the wide-field imaging data and how it is used to constrain the impact of the environment through κ_{ext} in Sect. 3.4.

3.1 WFI2033-4723

The quadruply-imaged quasar WFI2033 was first discovered by Morgan et al. (2004), wherein they applied color cuts to the Wide-Field Imager (WFI) on the MPG-ESO telescope. The redshift of the source was measured to be $z_s = 1.662$ by Sluse et al. (2012), with the deflector at $z_d = 0.6575 \pm 0.0002$ (Sluse et al. 2019) (hereafter H0LiCOW X). Its environment is relatively complicated, with at least six galaxies within 20 arcsec, three of which needing to be explicitly included in the lens model¹. The deflector is also in a group at z = 0.6588, with a scale radius predicted to be $r_{s,g} = 32.0 \pm 8.0$ arcsec, calculated by assuming its virial mass and radius (Rusu et al. 2020) (hereafter H0LiCOW XII). In addition, there exists a second group in its foreground (z = 0.4956) with its scale radius similarly measured at $r_{s,g} = 34.8 \pm 9.3$ arcsec.

3.2 JWST Imaging

WFI2033 was observed on JWST with both NIRCam imaging and NIRSpec IFU spectroscopy on September 19th, 2022 (GTO Program #1198; PI: Stiavelli). The program aims to leverage the gravitational lensing effect of the deflector, which spatially stretches the quasar's image, to study the relationship between the quasar and its host galaxy with greater rest frame angular



Fig. 3. Environment of WFI2033 with black labels denoting the main deflector (D), its nearby satellite (X) and the three galaxy perturbers, (G2, G3, and G7) along with their redshifts. The quasar images are labeled in blue.

resolution than otherwise possible. Two other quadruply-imaged systems were also observed, whose NIRCam models are planned in following publications.

The NIRCam observations were done with 4 primary INTRAMODULEX dithers with the SHALLOW2 readout pattern, producing a slightly higher angular resolution (~ 0".0307 in the F115W band) than the default pixel size. The bright quasar images were not saturated and as such did not require masking. This is extremely beneficial for our point source modeling, later discussed in Sect. 4. There were 9 groups per iteration, with a total exposure time of ~ 1800 sec. The uncertainty on the flux in each pixel was estimated from the science image, and is a combination of the resampled Poisson, read noise, and flat-field variances added in quadrature. While this data also includes the F150W, F277W, and F356W bands, one of the largest bottlenecks of modeling this high resolution data is computational time. For this reason, we choose to exclusively model the F115W band, as it offers the highest spatial resolution which surpasses HST at equivalent wavelength. Our lens model is based on a 4.6" (150 pixel) square cutout of the reduced data, with a 0".15 mask applied to the very center of the deflector.

3.3 Spectroscopic Data

The spectroscopic observations are presented in via the ESO-MUSE integral field spectrograph H0LiCOW X, which we summarize here. The lens lies within a galaxy group at z = 0.6588with a velocity dispersion of $\sigma = 500 \pm 80 \text{km s}^{-1}$ measured from 22 member galaxies (Wilson et al. 2016; Momcheva et al. 2006, 2015). The velocity dispersion for the main deflector was measured to be $\sigma_{\text{LOS}} = 250 \text{km s}^{-1}$ with a total uncertainty of $\sigma_{\sigma_{\text{LOS}}} = 19 \text{km s}^{-1}$. Additional multi-object spectroscopic data was collected for constraints on galaxies in the vicinity (< 2')

¹ The updated analysis in H0LiCOW XII found only one of these three galaxies to be above the standard flexion shift cutoff of $\Delta_3 x > 10^{-4}$ asec, but the two other galaxies were included to be safe. For a fair comparison, we also choose to include all 3 perturbing galaxies.

of the lens, using the ESO FORS (Appenzeller et al. 1998) and Gemini GMOS (Hook et al. 2004) instruments.

JWST NIRSpec data was also taken for WFI2033, which we plan on modeling for spatially resolved kinematics in future analyses, which will enable tight constraints for more general mass models of the deflector. As the focus of this paper is the power-law model, we use the higher resolution of NIRCam to this end.

3.4 Wide-Field Photometric Data and External Convergence

Measurements utilizing time-delay cosmography are sensitive to whether the system resides in a relatively over- or under-dense line-of-sight (defined as κ_{ext} , see e.g. Eq. (15)), but these densities are not directly observable. In response, κ_{ext} is estimated by matching observable tracers in the wide-field data to those in simulations—a process that has undergone multiple developments over time (Suyu & Halkola 2010; Fassnacht et al. 2011; Suyu et al. 2013; Greene et al. 2013; Wells et al. 2023, 2024a).

Therefore, wide-field photometric data is needed for photometric redshift measurements, galaxy-star classification, and measurements of the stellar masses of all galaxies i < 23mag within a 120 arcsec radius. These data are described in H0LiCOW X, with the resulting values of κ_{ext} computed in H0LiCOW XII, which we keep consistent for this analysis. While the cosmological predictions of WFI2033 will require updated sampling of κ_{ext}^2 , this has a negligible impact on a oneto-one comparison of lens models due to the resulting modelindependence of κ_{ext} . Because of this, any comparison of models must be done using the same sample of κ_{ext} . In this work, our aim is to compare models of HST- and JWST-based data. So, for a fair comparison, we use the same sample of κ_{ext} as Rusu et al. (2020) in our lens modeling and note any inference on cosmological parameters will require an update in the sampling of external convergence, which is left for future work.

4 JWST PSF Reconstruction

Careful consideration must be taken to ensure the complex, extended PSF structure does not bias measurements of our parameters. Shajib et al. (2022) and Ding et al. (2021) demonstrated that, even for the same imaging data, models with different PSFs can have significant discrepancies on crucial model parameters, such as the power-law slope, γ , or the external shear, γ_{ext} . As this is the first cosmographic strong lens model with JWST's challenging PSF, we will discuss a new method to model the PSF, and compare it to the method adopted by recent studies to describe the HST PSF.

While the extent of the PSF may be similar to HST, Figure Fig. 2 illustrates how the complexity of the PSF has increased. A crucial step in lens modeling is the separation of the source's light into the *extended component*, contributing to the ring-like structure of the lens, and the *point source component*, contributing to the bright images seen at image positions A, B, C, and D. A model incorrectly disentangling these components can fit non-physical–or even non-existent–light structure, potentially biasing the model. For example, a bias in the powerlaw slope, closely tied to the source light profile, will bias the final inference of H_0 .

4.1 Initial PSF Model

To generate an initial PSF, we followed the standard procedure of extracting stars in the field as reference. Ideally, a selection of stars should be as close to the lens galaxy in angular separation as possible to minimize the effects of PSF distortion across the field. However, a larger constraint on star selection proved to be finding stars of similar flux to the lensed quasar images. Having similar flux is crucial to avoid discrepancies caused by saturation and non linear effects at the bright end and by noise at the faint end. Across the entire 2.5' square field, 13 stars have desirable flux, with three saturating the centers of their PSFs, and four being on the edge of an exposure. Our selection is composed of the remaining 6 stars.

Previous strong lens modeling approaches typically utilize either the astropy³ core package photoutils (Astropy Collaboration et al. 2022) or the more recently developed PSFr (Birrer et al. 2022). We will be comparing to PSFr, which implements the following algorithm:

- 1. Get an initial guess of the PSF by stacking the cutout stars (without any recentering)
- 2. Calculate the sub-pixel centroid of each star's cutout
- 3. Fit for the sub-pixel centroid of the PSF model
- 4. Line up the sub-pixel centroids of your PSF model and each of the cutout stars
- 5. Interpolate the PSF model "into the frame" of each star with sub-pixel interpolation (keeping their centroids lined up)
- 6. Calculate the residuals of each interpolated PSF model to its star's cutout data
- 7. To combine the residuals from each of these different subpixel-interpolated frames, transform these residuals back "into the frame" of your PSF model (an "inverse sub-pixel shift")
- 8. With all the residuals in the PSF model's frame, stack them (e.g., median) to inform a correction to your PSF model
- 9. Repeat steps (4)-(8), optionally repeating step (3)

In this work, we implement STARRED (Michalewicz et al. 2023; Millon et al. 2024) as an alternative method to generate an initial PSF for strong lens modeling. STARRED directly addresses a few of the novel challenges that JWST proposes for strong lens modeling in particular.

First, wavelet regularization increases the population of suitable stars for PSF generation by reducing the influence of varying noise levels among the stars on the resulting PSF model. Instead of representing our PSF in a spatial pixel basis, STARRED exploits the isotropic wavelet basis of starlets (Starck et al. 2006). Our PSF is sparsely represented in this starlet space, meaning it can be reconstructed with a linear combination of very few of these starlet bases. This is *not* true of the noise. As a result, one can simply select and add up the few coefficients required to reconstruct the PSF, dropping the low-power coefficients composing noise. This denoising process is called *image thresholding*, and is one of the main benefits of wavelet regularization.

Second, sparse regularization has been shown to improve photometric accuracy and astrometric precision to better than a

² Recent discussions have raised questions on whether the modelpredicted external shear ($\gamma_{\text{ext, mod}}$) should be included as a prior for solving for κ_{ext} , as it may not correlate one-to-one with the physical shear in these environments (e.g., Etherington et al. 2023). As this topic is not the focus of this work, we decide to sample the same distribution of κ_{ext} —still informed by $\gamma_{\text{ext, mod}}$ —as H0LiCOW XII to guarantee a fair comparison.

³ http://www.astropy.org

hundredth of a pixel for high signal-to-noise data (Fig. 4 of Millon et al. 2024), the latter of which being crucial for tight constraints on image positions and thus H_0 (Birrer & Treu 2019).

We estimate uncertainty in the PSF based on residuals of our initial fitting of field stars. Residuals without the additional uncertainty due to the PSF are shown in Fig. C.1 and discussed in Appendix C. We additionally crop the initial PSF models based on a minimum threshold, removing the bottom $\sim 1\%$ of the initial kernel. This removes the extended background noise from the initial PSFs (due to the differing fluxes of the quasar vs the stars used in the initial fit). Without this additional cropping, the point-sources used in the modeling would have extended light profiles that add a nonphysical sheet of flux across the image.

4.2 Iterative PSF Updating

After acquiring our initial PSF models, we iteratively update each model based on the quasar images during the image forward modelin (result shown in Fig. 4). By first subtracting the best lens light and extended source surface brightness profiles, we can update the PSF with the additional four remaining quasar point-sources, which is repeated until the PSF model converges to a solution (or reaches 100 iterations). This entire process is repeated six times during the initial fitting process for each model, to avoid biasing the PSF model based on our initial parameter values or overall model parameterization. We use the same PSFr-based iteration method for both initial PSF models. We use a completely asymmetric PSF, as we found the image residuals cannot be accurately modeled with any amount of symmetry. We do not update our PSF error map during the fitting (for more information on the error map, see Appendix C).



Fig. 4. Comparison of the PSF kernels used. First we show the STARRED initial PSF kernel, followed by an example updated PSF from one of the STARRED models. Then we show the PSFr initial PSF kernel, again followed by an example updated PSF from a PSFr model.

5 Modeling

This section describes the modeling procedures used to fit the JWST NIRCam data for the final inference on lens parameters. For our analysis, we used Lenstronomy⁴, a python software package developed by Birrer & Amara (2018b) (Birrer et al. 2015, 2021). The accuracy of Lenstronomy has been verified through methods such as the Time-Delay Lens Modelling Challenge, where "true parameters" of a simulated system were hidden from different analysis teams (Ding et al. 2021). Since then, it continues seeing use as one of the primary modeling methods for time-delay cosmography today.

Priors on all parameters are uniform with values based on initial modeling of the system, unless otherwise stated, and are summarized in Table 1.

5.1 Main Deflector Galaxy D

The main deflector is a massive elliptical galaxy. Following standard practice and to facilitate comparison with the previous analysis (Rusu et al. 2020) we characterize its mass profile via the power-law elliptical mass distribution (PEMD; Barkana 1998) specified by

$$\kappa_{\text{PEMD}}\left(\theta_{1},\theta_{2}\right) \coloneqq \frac{3-\gamma}{2} \left[\frac{\theta_{\text{E}}}{\sqrt{q_{\text{m}}\theta_{1}^{2}+\theta_{2}^{2}/q_{\text{m}}}}\right]^{\gamma-1}.$$
(27)

Free parameters are the logarithmic slope (γ), the Einstein radius ($\theta_{\rm E}$), and the axis ratio ($q_{\rm m}$). If the angle of the major axis is given by $\varphi_{\rm m}$ with reference to the RA-Dec frame, then we define the coordinates, (θ_1 , θ_2), aligned with the major and minor axes.

For the deflector's light profile, we use two (elliptical) Sérsic profiles,

$$I(\theta_1, \theta_2) = A \exp\left\{-k\left(\left(\frac{\sqrt{q_L \theta_1^2 + \theta_2^2/q_L}}{r_{\text{eff}}}\right)^{1/n} - 1\right)\right\},\tag{28}$$

with the amplitude (*A*), the effective (half-light) radius (r_{eff}), the axis ratio (q_{L}), the Sérsic index (*n*), and a corrective constant (*k*) (Sérsic 1968).

The two Sérsic light profiles struggle to fit the very center of the deflector, but this has little impact on our lens model. Since fitting the lens light serves two roles—providing a light model for the kinematic analysis and removing the lens light contribution from the extended source's ring structure—we assess how a mask would impact these goals. Preliminary tests showed that masking this region had little effect on model-predicted velocity dispersions, and the ring structure lies sufficiently far from the deflector's center. Therefore, we mask the central 0".15 to prevent this region from driving the fit (shown in Fig. 5).

We include an additional external shear term to account for distortion by the large-scale structure of the lens environment, such as the group's halo. We further constrain the ellipticity and position angle of the mass profile based on the observed ellipticity and position angle of the light profile following Schmidt et al. (2022). And, to mitigate degeneracies caused by the external shear, we apply a Gaussian prior on the ellipticity parameters.

⁴ https://github.com/sibirrer/lenstronomy



Fig. 5. An example model output from the best performing model, seen in Table B.1, though the other models are qualitatively indistinguishable. **Top left** shows the observed image, **top middle** shows the model-predicted reconstruction of the image, and **top right** shows the fit's residuals normalized by the estimated uncertainty of each pixel (see Appendix C for more details). **Bottom left** is the reconstructed source plot, featuring more detail than any parametric source modeled for time-delay cosmography thus far. The star symbol denotes the location of the quasar host galaxy's centroid. **Bottom middle** shows the lensed, unconvolved extended-source light, and **bottom right** shows the magnification map of the system.

5.2 Quasar and Host Galaxy

The quasar is modeled as point sources in the image plane convolved with the PSF, whose generation is further detailed in Sect. 4. We constrain the image positions within an astrometric precision of 0.34 mas, well below the astrometric requirements for cosmography (Birrer & Treu 2019).

In addition to the point-source structure generated by the quasar, we also fit the extended light produced by the quasar's host galaxy. To account for its complexity, we add standard linear shapelet functions (Refregier 2003; Birrer et al. 2015) to our quasar host galaxy's Sérsic light profile. The host galaxy's parameterization is explicitly left scale invariant, as forcing a fixed source reconstruction scale can assume an incorrect solution to the mass-sheet transformation, underestimating uncertainties in H_0 (Birrer et al. 2016).

We find the optimal number of shapelet bases to reconstruct the source by finding the BIC turnover point, where the additional complexity of more shapelets becomes incommensurate with the goodness-of-fit as determined by the Bayes Information Criterion (BIC). All initial conditions are kept the same between these models, with the only distinction being the maximum polynomial order permitted by the model. Notably, we find that the largest polynomial order tested ($n_{max} = 30$) still recovers better BIC values than lower-order models; however, the computational time is nonlinear with n_{max} . Because of this, we adopt the significantly faster polynomial orders of $n_{max} \in \{18, 20, 22\}$, with a minor drop in accuracy of the source reconstruction.

5.3 Galaxy-Scale Perturbers

Of the nearby galaxy perturbers, H0LiCOW X determined three had a flexion shift large enough such that their direct inclusion in the lens model is necessary, due to potential higher-order effects. H0LiCOW XII redid the flexion shift analysis, finding only one of these perturbers (labeled G2) to be above the threshold, however they included the other two perturbers (labeled G3 and G7) to be safe⁵. In addition, there is a small perturber near the main deflector, which is assumed to be a satellite at the same redshift due to lack of a spectrum, labeled X in Fig. 3.

G2 has the largest flexion shift of the galaxy perturbers, due to its close proximity and comparable size to the main deflector D. We also include a light profile for G2 due to its proximity, representing it with a single Sérsic. G2 also lies outside of the lens plane, at a redshift of $z_{G2} = 0.7450$ (while $z_D = 0.6575$). We take this into account when converting its velocity dispersion ($\sigma_{LOS, G2} = 223^{+14}_{-8}$ km s⁻¹) into the Einstein radius assuming that the lensing velocity dispersion is equal to the stellar velocity

⁵ In addition to galaxies, H0LiCOW X also measured and made predictions on the impact of galaxy groups on the lens potential. While no group was found to have a flexion shift above the typical threshold of $\Delta_3 x > 10^{-4}$, H0LiCOW XII also included two group halos in the model for extra caution . While these models did recover the best BIC values, the improvement was within the typical BIC variance. Because of this, we do not explicitly include these groups in the model to minimize the number of nonlinear parameters and computational time.

dispersion within the scatter (Treu et al. 2006). Thus, effectively, we model the system with the multi-plane lens equation.

G3 lies significantly far ($\approx 7.2''$) from the lens as to not require modeling of its surface brightness profile, however G3 may have a flexion shift large enough to require direct modeling of the mass distribution. Therefore, we model its mass with an SIS profile. H0LiCOW X measured a velocity dispersion of $\sigma_{\text{LOS, G3}} = 79^{+23}_{-19} \text{km s}^{-1}$, which we convert to a prior on the Einstein radius, with the same redshift as the deflector as their redshifts are consistent within the range allowed by peculiar velocities.

Similarly, G7 is also far enough away such that a surface brightness profile does not need to be included. However its gravitational effects may not be negligible, and therefore we model G7 with an SIS profile anchored to its measured velocity dispersion of $\sigma_{\text{LOS, G7}} = 166^{+7}_{-6} \text{km s}^{-1}$ at the redshift of the deflector.

5.4 Satellite X

In the previous HST power-law models, H0LiCOW XII found the mass of the satellite X to be unconstrained by the imaging data, with an SIS Einstein radius of $\theta_{\rm E} = 0.018^{+0.002}_{-0.002}$. In this work, we also fit an SIS profile centered on a Sérsic light profile, due to its proximity to the deflector. To get a rough, initial estimate of the satellite's Einstein radius, we assume it follows the Faber-Jackson relation (Faber & Jackson 1976) and estimate its radius based on a preliminary model's radius of the deflector, yielding $\theta_{\rm E.X.,\,init} \approx 0.15''$.

5.5 Flexion

Models for time-delay cosmography feature higher-order corrections of the lens potential for any mass affecting the system that is not explicitly included in our lens models. The second order corrections for an external mass' affect on the lensing potential is given by the external convergence correction (Sect. 3.4), which changes the scale/magnification of the lensed image, and the external shear term (Sect. 7.2), which results in a stretching of the lensed image.

One of the questions for higher spatial resolution data is whether these typical corrective terms used in the past are sufficient for this data, or if the increase in resolution requires additional higher-order corrections. After the second-order shear and convergence terms, the next term would be the third-order correction called flexion (Goldberg & Bacon 2005). To test this, one of our systematic choices is the addition of a free flexion term, which allows the model to additionally vary a triangular bending effect on the lensed light. This additional term has only been applied to one time-delay cosmography system thus far (J1721+8842, Schmidt et al., in-prep).

5.6 Additional Constraints

The velocity dispersions of the galaxy-scale perturbers (G2, G3, and G7) are used to estimate their Einstein radii. The ratios of these radii are fixed and scaled together using a single scaling parameter. To encode maximum information, we convert the lower/upper 1σ estimates of the velocity dispersions into our 1σ estimates in $\theta_{\rm E}$. This mitigates potential degeneracies arising from the perturbers' positions (and the additional external shear), and prevents the model from optimizing the radii in a

way that is inconsistent with their measured redshifts and velocity dispersions.

To accurately account for G2, we must solve the multi-plane lens equation, which requires adopting a cosmology. Since we are concerned with comparing two lens models and not with doing cosmographic inference, this does not affect our conclusions.

We join the source-plane position of the quasar with the center of the Sérsic and its shapelets, the latter two comprising the host galaxy's extended light. We also join the centers of the two Sérsics describing the bulge and disk components of D. For both the satellite and G2, we bind the center of their mass profiles with their light profiles.

The point-source positions of the quasar are constrained by the pixels of the JWST image, assuming the PSF model described in Sect. 4. This allows us to solve the lens equation to constrain six of the lens mass parameters, one for each of the independent, relative positions of the 4 images. This is done with the PROFILE_SHEAR solver in Lenstronomy, which solves for the following non-linear parameters of D: its centroid (RA and Dec), axis ratio and position angle (represented as e_1 and e_2), Einstein radius (θ_E), and the angle of external shear (ϕ_{ext}).

5.7 Image Forward Modeling

Given a proposed set of these parameters, the linear response functions in the data (such as amplitude parameters, point sources, and coefficients of shapelets) are rendered in the image plane and optimized with a linear minimization method based on the imaging likelihood.

We supersample the central regions of the point sources by a factor of 3 for ray-tracing and perform the PSF convolution on this subset of the data using the adaptive compute mode. This provides improved constraints on the image positions, as well as avoiding aliasing and other artifacts resulting from modeling sub-pixel features in the PSF. We do not apply the PSF convolution on the entire supersampled image, as this quickly dominates the computational cost. To benefit from the supersampled grid, the PSF kernel must also be supersampled at a scale of 3. Without a supersampled PSF, the sub-pixel scale features of the PSF would not be accurately accounted for in the convolution, leading to poor fitting of the image positions. By confining this process to only the regions nearest the PSFs, we still gain the increase in accuracy without suffering the computational cost.

Our uncertainty in the data is given by the 2-D resampled Poisson, readout noise, and flat-field variance estimates summed in quadrature, which we then scale by the weight map to account for the drizzling procedure. We add additional uncertainty in the data to account for uncertainty in the PSF models, discussed in Appendix C.

5.8 Likelihood Sampling

When computing the image likelihood, we punish models that do not map the multiple images match back to the same position in the source plane with a 0''004 tolerance level. We also punish models with negative Sérsic or point-source amplitudes. We only compute the image likelihood on a subset of the data, as light at the center of the main deflector or far outside the ring contains little information as long as the light profile of the main deflector is accurately represented near the ring itself. The MASK systematic test (in Sect. 6.1) extends the size of the outer radial mask, to ensure this choice does not bias our results.

Object	Component	Parameter	Distribution	Initial Position	Step Size (1σ)
	Mass: PEMD	$ heta_{\mathrm{E, PEMD}} \ heta_{\mathrm{E, PEMD}} \ heta_{\mathrm{PEMD}} \ (e_1, e_2) \ (x, y)$	N(0.879, 0.133) U(1.5, 2.5) N(0, 0.2) U(-3, 3)	0.879 1.95 (-0.047, 0.107) (-0.031, 0.021)	0.133 0.02 0.2 0.003
Main Deflector (D) z = 0.6575	Light: Bulge Sérsic	$ \frac{R_{\text{sersic}}}{n_{\text{sersic}}} \\ \frac{(e_1, e_2)}{(x, y)} $	U(0.001, 5) Fixed U(-0.2, 0.2) U(-1, 1)	0.296 4 (-0.048, 0.089) (-0.009, 0.009)	0.01 0.1 0.003
	Light: Disk Sérsic	$ \frac{R_{\text{sersic}}}{n_{\text{sersic}}} \\ \frac{(e_1, e_2)}{(x, y)} $	U(0.001, 5) Fixed U(-0.5, 0.5) Joined with Bulge Sérsic	1.752 1 (-0.164, 0.154)	0.05 0.1
External Shear $z = 0.6575$	Mass: Shear	$\begin{array}{l} \gamma_{\text{ext, 1}} \\ \gamma_{\text{ext, 2}} \\ (x, y) \end{array}$	U(-0.5, 0.5) U(-0.5, 0.5) Fixed	0.109 0.025 0	0.1 0.1
Satellite (X) z = 0.6575	Mass: SIS	$\theta_{\rm E, X}$ $\gamma_{\rm ext, 2}$ (x, y)	U(0.0001, 0.25) U(-0.5, 0.5) Joined with Light	0.15 0.025	0.01 0.1
	Light: Sérsic	$ \frac{R_{\text{sersic}}}{n_{\text{sersic}}} \\ \frac{n_{\text{sersic}}}{(e_1, e_2)} \\ \frac{(x, y)}{(x, y)} $	U(0.0001, 0.1) U(1, 10) Fixed $U(\text{Initial} \pm 0.07)$	0.044 2 (0.015, 0.018) (0.228, 2.046)	0.01 0.2 0.003
	Mass: SIS	$ heta_{\mathrm{E, G2}} \ (x, y)$	<i>N</i> (0.622, 0.062) Joined with Light	0.622	0.1
Galaxy G2 z = 0.7450	Light: Sérsic	$ \frac{R_{\text{sersic}}}{n_{\text{sersic}}} \\ \frac{(e_1, e_2)}{(x, y)} $	U(0.001, 5) U(0.1, 2) Fixed Fixed	1 0.5 (0, 0) (-3.998, -0.034)	0.05 0.1
Galaxy G3 $z = 0.6575$	Mass: SIS	$ heta_{ ext{E, G3}}(x,y)$	$N(0.088, 0.048)^{\dagger}$ Fixed	(2.823, 7.006)	
Galaxy G7 $z = 0.6575$	Mass: SIS	$ heta_{ ext{E, G7}} (x, y)$	<i>N</i> (0.388, 0.030) [†] Fixed	(-4.578, -11.719)	
Free Flexion $z = 0.6575$	Mass: Flexion	(g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4) (x, y)	<i>U</i> (-0.1, 0.1) Fixed	0 (0, 0)	0.01
Quasar Images $z = 0.6575$	Light: Point Sources	$ \begin{array}{c} A1(x,y) \\ A2(x,y) \\ B(x,y) \\ C(x,y) \end{array} $	$U(\text{Initial} \pm 0.3)$	(-0.760, 0.958) (-0.050, 1.076) (1.434, -0.302) (-0.686, -0.579)	0.007 0.007 0.007 0.007
Quasar Host Galaxy z = 1.662	Light: Sérsic	R_{sersic} n_{sersic} (e_1, e_2) (x, y)	$U(0.04, 0.3) U(0.15, 4) U(-0.15, 0.15) U(Initial \pm 1)$	0.2 1 (0, 0) (-0.45, 0.1)	0.01 0.25 0.03 0.03
	Light: Shapelets	$\frac{\beta}{n_{\max}}$ (x, y)	U(0.031, 0.3) Fixed Joined with Sérsic	$\begin{array}{c} 0.031 \\ \{18, 20, 22\} \end{array}$	0.025 0.1

Table 1. Model parameter priors used, with some values rounded.

Notes. Parameters grouped by components (Deflector, Sérsic 1, Shapelets) with their corresponding types (Mass or Light). The bounds are represented as uniform distributions, with initial guesses and sampling step sizes (σ).

While the Einstein radii are given priors, their actual values are scaled with G2. This ensures the constraints provided by their observed velocity dispersions are passed to the models, while also minimizing the degeneracies between their parameters.

We introduce a likelihood penalty for models where the main misaligned with, its light profile, inspired by the approach of deflector's mass profile is significantly more elliptical than, or Schmidt et al. 2022. Without this additional constraint, we find the large number of perturbers lead to a nonphysical degeneracy in the deflector's mass ellipticity. We add a flat prior to ensure the axis ratio of the mass profile, $q_{\rm L}$, agrees within 0.2 of the lens-light's axis ratio, q_{LL} , ensuring that

$$q_{\rm LL} - q_{\rm L} < 0.2.$$
 (29)

Similarly, we enforce a constraint to ensure that the position angles of the mass profile, $\phi_{\rm L}$, and the lens-light profile, $\phi_{\rm LL}$, are aligned. Specifically, we penalize configurations where the angular difference between these two position angles exceeds a certain threshold, which is a function of the mass profile's axis ratio, $q_{\rm L}$. The alignment criterion is defined as:

$$\Delta PA = |\phi_{L} - \phi_{LL}| \times \frac{180}{\pi},\tag{30}$$

where ΔPA is the difference in position angles in degrees. Configurations are rejected if

$$\Delta PA > 10 - \frac{5}{q_{\rm L} - 1.0001}.$$
(31)

This condition ensures that the mass and light profiles remain well-aligned, particularly for more elliptical systems where misalignment is less tolerable. A small offset is introduced to prevent numerical instabilities in the computation.

Combined Analysis 6

This section describes how the systematic tests were combined to form the final inference on the Fermat potential. We first review the systematic tests considered for the final inference in Sect. 6.1 (a complete list of preliminary tests can be found in Appendix A). Then, we discuss how these models were weighted and combined in Sect. 6.2.

6.1 Primary Systematic Tests

Here, we summarize the model combinations introduced in Sect. 5:

- Two choices for the the inclusion of free flexion,
 - No Flexion
 - Flexion
- Three choices with increasing flexibility in source surface brightness complexity.6
 - SERSIC+18n_{max}
 - SERSIC+20n_{max}
- SERSIC+22n_{max}
 Two different pixel masks for the imaging likelihood – MASK 2.1" (or 68 pixel) radius
 - MASK 2.2" (or 71 pixel) radius
- Two different initial PSF generation methods
 - STARRED PSF
 - PSFr PSF

This gives 24 separate model configurations-and thus 24 separate Fermat potential difference posteriors-which are combined through a weighted sampling, discussed in Sect. 6.2. To optimize the lens model, we first use a Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) algorithm to identify high-likelihood regions, then refine those solutions with a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampler to fully map out the posterior distributions. We also iteratively refine the PSF for each model between the PSO steps, making it more robust to any bias introduced by model choices. Each model takes approximately one week to run on 36 cores.

6.2 Model Weighting

To ensure our parameterization does not bias our results, we give each model a weight based on its ability to predict the data, and then combine these weighted models to form the final inference. As expected, we observe significant variability in the models' ability to reconstruct the imaging data. Further, goodness-of-fit statistics on imaging data alone cannot distinguish models with diverging physical interpretations, as profiles can become masssheet transforms of each other (Sect. 2.2). To address this, models are assigned two separate weights that are combined for the final inference: the first reflecting their ability to reconstruct the imaging data, and the second their ability to predict the deflector's velocity dispersion. The models are then combined to form a final weighted prediction. The resulting model weights can be found in Table B.1.

6.2.1 Imaging-Based Weighting

To prevent overly-complex models from being unjustly favored, we employ the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) to statistically weight our 24 models. Compared to similar criteria such as the Akaike information criterion (AIC), the BIC is more penalizing to model complexity, encouraging more parsimonious solutions. Formally,

BIC =
$$\ln(n)k - 2\ln(\hat{L})$$
, (32)

where n is the number of data points, k is the number of model parameters, and \hat{L} is the maximum likelihood of the model. Within a 2.1" mask, n = 14,592 pixels, and for 2.3" it is n = 15,930 pixels. The number of nonlinear parameters is either 32 or 36, based on choice of Flexion, while the number of linear parameter ranges from 199 to 285. The BIC remains a valid criterion here as $n \gg k$.

Formally, the BIC comparison is only valid for models fit to the same data set. One of our systematics is mask size, which inherently changes the size of the data. As an approximation, following Wong et al. (2017) and Birrer et al. (2019), we use the same mask (the smaller of the two) to calculate χ^2 and the BIC, allowing consistent model comparisons despite slight differences in the masked region.

When comparing any two models M_1 and M_2 with BIC values BIC₁ and BIC₂, their relative probabilities can be written as

$$\frac{p(M_1)}{p(M_2)} \propto \exp\left[-\frac{\text{BIC}_1 - \text{BIC}_2}{2}\right].$$
(33)

Defining BIC_{min} as the lowest BIC among all models, we weight each model n by

$$f_{\rm BIC}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \le {\rm BIC}_{\rm min}, \\ \exp\left[-\frac{x - {\rm BIC}_{\rm min}}{2}\right] & \text{if } x > {\rm BIC}_{\rm min}, \end{cases}$$
(34)

where x is the model's BIC. This piecewise definition penalizes large BIC values.

However, following Birrer et al. (2019) and TDCOSMO IX, we additionally convolve each model's nominal BIC_n with a Gaussian of width $\sigma_{\text{intrinsic}}$, reflecting our uncertainty in BIC due to limited sampling and systematics. We estimate $\sigma_{
m intrinsic}$ by comparing BIC values across our shapelet tests (n_{max} = 18, 20, 22), fixing the other tests (No Flexion PSF, STARRED

⁶ We verify our choices are above the minimum data-supported threshold in Appendix D.

PSF, MASK 2.1"). That convolution ensures that small fluctuations in BIC_n do not spuriously dominate the weighting. Specifically, each model (n) receives a single BIC-based weight:

$$W_{\text{abs},n} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \,\sigma_{\text{intrinsic}}} \exp\left[-\frac{(\text{BIC}_n - x)^2}{2 \,\sigma_{\text{intrinsic}}^2}\right] f_{\text{BIC}}(x) \, dx. \tag{35}$$

The final relative weight W_n is then normalized so that $\max(W_n) = 1.$

Because each model has exactly one BIC-based weight, all individual MCMC draws from that model share that weight. Models with lower (better) BIC values receive proportionally more draws in the final aggregated parameter space. We find that resampling the MCMC chain for each model according to W_n offers an efficient combination of our systematically different lens models, ensuring each model is represented fairly in the final posterior distribution.

As our models are a relatively sparse sample of all possible configurations, the BIC-based weights help mitigate overfitting tendencies while still including sufficiently flexible models. For parameters such as the Fermat potential differences, our sampling is dense enough that the weighted posterior remains robust. For the broader BIC distribution itself, the convolution integral accounts for scatter, ensuring no single model with an artificially low BIC is overemphasized.

6.2.2 Kinematics-Based Weighting

Our second weight assesses consistency with the observed velocity dispersion of the main deflector. For each MCMC sample, we compute the model-predicted velocity dispersion, $\sigma_{\rm ap, model}$, then assign a kinematic weight based on a Gaussian likelihood centered on the observed velocity dispersion, $\sigma_{obs,D}$:

$$f_{\rm kin} = \mathcal{N}(\sigma_{\rm ap, \ model} \mid \sigma_{\rm obs, \ D}, \ \sigma_{\rm obs, \sigma}), \tag{36}$$

taking into account the uncertainty in the observed velocity dispersion, $\sigma_{obs,\sigma}$. This effectively penalizes models that predict significantly different $\sigma_{
m ap,\ model}$ from the measured dispersion.

We then combine the kinematic weight with the BIC-based imaging weight to form a *total weight*:

$$W_{\text{total}} = W_{\text{BIC}} \times f_{\text{kin}}.$$
 (37)

After computing W_{total} for each model sample, we normalize it such that $max(W_{total}) = 1$. For the final posterior combination in the corner plots, each MCMC sample is drawn in proportion to W_{total} . For the final parameter estimates, we instead calculate the weighted median and 16th/84th percentiles.

7 **Results and Discussion**

We recover a 22% tighter estimate of the Fermat potential difference after incorporating both kinematic and imaging constraints (Fig. 6). While our results remain consistent with previous models, our measured 3.1% increase in the Fermat potential suggests a corresponding 3.1% increase in this lens' inferred value of H_0 , assuming all other parameters remain unchanged. This adjustment would shift the median measured H_0 for this lens from 71.6 to 73.8 kms^{-1} Mpc⁻¹, with uncertainties likely similar to the HST result. A comprehensive cosmographic analysis, including a resampling of the external convergence (κ_{ext}), will be presented in a forthcoming paper, which could further adjust the overall H_0 estimate in either direction.

We find models including free flexion introduce a new degeneracy between the Fermat potential and the Einstein radius of the main deflector, which the non-flexion models do not have. This implies the additional degrees of freedom granted by free Flexion are not constrained by the data alone, and so we discard flexion models for the final inference. Similar to H0LiCOW XII, we also find the kinematic weighting had little effect on the final inference of the Fermat potential. A corner plot of our posteriors is shown in Fig. 7, with final parameter estimates reported in Table 2.

Power-Law Model Parameters

Parameter	This work (JWST)	H0LiCOW XII [‡] (HST)
$\Delta au_{ m BC}$	$0.469^{+0.007}_{-0.009}$	$0.455^{\rm +0.010}_{\rm -0.009}$
$\Delta au_{ m BA1}$	$0.311\substack{+0.005\\-0.007}$	$0.298^{\mathrm{+0.010}}_{\mathrm{-0.007}}$
$\Delta au_{ m BA2}$	$0.330^{+0.006}_{-0.008}$	$0.31^{+0.04}_{-0.02}$
$\Theta_{E,PEMD}$	$0.977^{+0.002}_{-0.002}$	$0.93^{+0.01}_{-0.02}$
$\gamma_{ ext{PEMD}}$	$1.86^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$1.95_{-0.01}^{+0.02}$
$q_{\rm PEMD}$	$0.774^{\rm +0.010}_{\rm -0.007}$	$0.79^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$
$\phi_{ m PEMD}$	$30.3_{-0.5}^{+0.7}$	$33.0_{-0.9}^{+0.8}$
$\gamma_{\rm ext}$	$0.088^{+0.003}_{-0.003}$	$0.112^{+0.006}_{-0.004}$
$\phi_{\rm ext}$	95^{+5}_{-5}	84_{-2}^{+7}
$\Theta_{\rm EX}$	$0.100^{+0.005}_{-0.005}$	$0.0009^{+0.0010}_{-0.0007}$

Table 2. BIC+Kinematic-weighted posterior parameter estimates.

Notes.	Reported	values	are	medians	with	errors	corresponding	to
the 16t	h and 84th	percer	tile	s.				

0.93+0.03

 232_{-7}^{+10}

 $0.78^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$

 236^{+20}_{-9}

- [‡] We note our weighting process may differ slightly for rounding discrepancies to values reported in H0LiCOW XII.
- ^{‡‡} The GLEE parameterization used an SIE model for G2, while we fit an SIS model due to degeneracies with the other perturbers.

7.1 Satellite Constraints

 $\Theta_{E,G2}$

 $\sigma_{\rm v}$

The PEMD models in H0LiCOW XII found satellite X to have mass consistent with zero, indicative of poor constraints from the HST-based data. In addition, their models found an offset between the mass and light centroids for the main deflector of 0.02 - 0.03'' (~ 200 pc, assuming flat ACDM cosmology with h = 0.7 and $\Omega_{\rm m} = 0.3$). The influence of satellite X (lying to the north-west) was proposed as a partial potential explanation, as the mass' centroid was found to be south-east of the light.

Our models place the Einstein radius of satellite X at $\theta_{E,X}$ = $0.100^{+0.005}_{-0.005}$, far closer to the theoretical value of $\theta_{\text{E,X, init}} \approx 0.15$, estimated in Sect. 5.4. However, our models still identify the offset of the deflector's mass, though smaller in scale.

7.2 External Shear

The previous HST-based models were unable to explain the large shears required to model the system, even after including two large galaxy groups along the LOS (which we do not explicitly





Fig. 6. Comparison of the Fermat Potential differences of images B and C between the HST models (Rusu et al. 2020, orange) and this work (blue). The fractional uncertainty (measured as the standard deviation over the median) is given to the right of the measurements. Vertically, we display the different weighting schemes, starting with the unweighted models at the **top**. In the **second row** we have the kinematic weighting, which preferentially weights both estimates slightly higher and wider. This is due to the model-predicted velocity dispersions being lower than the spectroscopically-observed velocity dispersion measured in H0LiCOW X. However, the velocity dispersion estimates are consistent across the HST and JWST models (see Fig. 7). The imaging weighting in the **third row** is far more constraining than the kinematics for this system, and it indicates the best-fitting models tend to be on the lower end of the models tested. This holds for both HST and JWST results. The estimate recovered by our best-fit models is $\sim 3.1\%$ higher, most likely due to tighter constraints on the satellite's mass provided by the NIRCam imaging. The **last row** combines both kinematics and imaging weights for the final estimate, with a 22% increase in precision compared to HST imaging.

model here, due to their minor impacts on the HST models, but will consider for the following cosmographic analysis paper).

In this work, leveraging the improved resolution and sensitivity of JWST imaging, we identify and robustly constrain the satellite galaxy X, which was only marginally detected in HST data. By constraining this satellite, we prevent the lens model from "absorbing" unmodeled mass distributions into a large external shear term. As a result, our models prefer a significantly smaller external shear, $\gamma_{ext} = 0.088$, approximately 21% lower than the values inferred by Rusu et al. (2020)'s HST-based power-law models. This value is in close agreement with the observed shear estimates from Wong et al. (2010)

7.3 Astrometry

In Fig. 8, we compare the astrometric precision of our models to the H0LiCOW XII results. The expected relative positions of the images, centered at (0, 0), are derived from HST observations with the brightest image (A1) serving as the reference point. Compared to these positions, our models achieve significantly smaller discrepancies than those constrained by the previous HST-based models. Specifically, we find deviations of 3.8 mas for the distance between images B-A1, 3.1 mas for A2-A1, and 4.8 mas for C-A1. These are of the order of a tenth of a NIRCam pixel. The overall relative astrometric uncertainty across all JWST models is 0.34 mas, obtained by adding the uncertainties of individual images in quadrature. This is approximately 1/100 of a NIRCam pixel. Our estimated errors do not include potential residual systematics in the distortion correction of NIRCam, which should be in any case very much sub-pixel, especially over a range of a few arcseconds covered by our target.

8 Conclusion

In this work, we aimed to extend the methods of time-delay cosmography to the first JWST imaging of quadruply-imaged quasars; discovering the benefits offered by the improved imaging while exploring potential systematic effects across telescopes. We modeled the system in the NIRCam F115W band, utilizing the spectroscopic data from Sluse et al. (2019), and applied the same wide-field data (external convergence) as Rusu et al. 2020 to enable a fair, one-to-one comparison with the previous HST models. To accurately model the system, we implemented new tools to model the PSF of the system, via STARRED. Our resulting Fermat potential difference is in agreement with the previous HST models at the 1σ level, well within expected uncertainties. The primary source of the discrepancy was the satellite, which was previously unconstrained in HST imaging.



Fig. 7. Parameter distributions from our lens model results, compared to H0LiCOW XII (HST-based data) in gray. Unweighted samples are shown in pink, with the final BIC+Kinematic-weighted selection is shown in green. The contours represent the 68.3%, and 99.7% quantiles.

With JWST data, our models recover a value in agreement with theoretical mass-to-light expectations. In summary:

- First sub-2% modeling uncertainty of any time-delay cosmography system, in agreement with previous HST models (Fig. 6)
- Increased accuracy of other key model parameters, such as the power-law slope, Einstein radius, and axis ratio (Table 2)
- Modeled JWST's PSF with STARRED, cutting 71% of the astrometric uncertainty compared to typical PSF-modeling techniques (Fig. 8) and enabling 17% smaller scale of source reconstructions (Appendix D)
- Enhanced accuracy in the Fermat potential, driven by improved constraints on the satellite's mass (Sect. 7.1). This also provides a direct observational demonstration of how PEMD models with external shear can overcompensate for small-scale effects—below the resolution limit of the data—by adjusting the external shear (Etherington et al. 2023).

We note this analysis was not done blinded to the model parameters in order to verify our handling of the PSF. However, the analysis was effectively blinded to H_0 as the system requires an updated sampling of the external convergence (κ_{ext}), a key in-

A&A proofs: manuscript no. main

Astrometry Comparison: JWST (STARRED vs PSFr) vs HST



Fig. 8. Relative image position discrepancies, centered based on the GLEE observed image positions. All distances are measured relative to the brightest image, A1. We note Lenstronomy requires the observed and predicted image positions to align. Image A2 also lies closest to the satellite, which is unconstrained in HST data, likely causing their largest discrepancy in image position. Our models demonstrate astrometry well within the requirements for time-delay cosmography (Birrer & Treu 2019), offering much tighter constraints than the previous HST-based GLEE models.

gredient in the final inference on H_0 . In our next paper, we will make the complete inference on H_0 for this system, along with two other quadruply-imaged quasars imaged with JWST.

For other future work, this analysis expands the sample of time-delay cosmography lenses to systems previously too faint to provide constraints on H_0 . This is extremely complementary to the explosion of new lenses from future surveys like LSST and Euclid, which will increase our sample of strong lens systems by two orders of magnitude (Collett 2015). Furthermore, develop-

ing methods to reliably constrain the PSF in fields with limited field stars will be critical, as the six suitable reference stars used in this field is unusually large.

Acknowledgements. DW and TT acknowledge support by NSF through grants NSF-AST-1906976 and NSF-AST-1836016, and from the Moore Foundation through grant 8548. Support for this work was provided by NASA through the NASA Hubble Fellowship grant HST-HF2-51492 awarded to AJS by the Space Telescope Science Institute, which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., for NASA, under contract NAS5-26555. This work is also supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers

JP24K07089, JP24H00221. MS is partly supported by NASA through grant 80NSSC21K1294.

- References
- Abdalla, E., Abellán, G. F., Aboubrahim, A., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2203.06142
- Appenzeller, I., Fricke, K., Fürtig, W., et al. 1998, The Messenger, 94, 1, aDS Bibcode: 1998Msngr..94....1A
- Astropy Collaboration, Price-Whelan, A. M., Lim, P. L., et al. 2022, ApJ, 935, 167
- Auger, M. W., Treu, T., Bolton, A. S., et al. 2010, The Astrophysical Journal, 724, 511, aDS Bibcode: 2010ApJ...724..511A
- Barkana, R. 1998, The Astrophysical Journal, 502, 531, arXiv:astro-ph/9802002 Bergé, J., Massey, R., Baghi, Q., & Touboul, P. 2019, Monthly Notices of the
- Royal Astronomical Society, 486, 544
- Birrer, S. 2021, The Astrophysical Journal, 919, 38, aDS Bibcode: 2021ApJ...919...38B
- Birrer, S. & Amara, A. 2018a, Physics of the Dark Universe, 22, 189
- Birrer, S. & Amara, A. 2018b, Physics of the Dark Universe, 22, 189, arXiv:1803.09746 [astro-ph]
- Birrer, S., Amara, A., & Refregier, A. 2015, The Astrophysical Journal, 813, 102, aDS Bibcode: 2015ApJ...813..102B
- Birrer, S., Amara, A., & Refregier, A. 2016, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics, 2016, 020, aDS Bibcode: 2016JCAP...08..020B
- Birrer, S., Bhamre, V., Nierenberg, A., Yang, L., & Van de Vyvere, L. 2022, Astrophysics Source Code Library, ascl:2210.005, aDS Bibcode: 2022ascl.soft10005B
- Birrer, S., Shajib, A. J., Galan, A., et al. 2020, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 643, A165, arXiv:2007.02941 [astro-ph]
- Birrer, S., Shajib, A. J., Gilman, D., et al. 2021, Journal of Open Source Software, 6.3283
- Birrer, S. & Treu, T. 2019, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 489, 2097
- Birrer, S., Treu, T., Rusu, C. E., et al. 2019, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 484, 4726
- Blandford, R. & Narayan, R. 1986, The Astrophysical Journal, 310, 568, aDS Bibcode: 1986ApJ...310..568B
- Bonvin, V., Millon, M., Chan, J. H.-H., et al. 2019, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 629, A97
- Chen, G. C.-F., Fassnacht, C. D., Suyu, S. H., et al. 2019, MNRAS[1907.02533]
- Collett, T. E. 2015, The Astrophysical Journal, 811, 20, arXiv:1507.02657 [astroph]
- Collett, T. E. & Auger, M. W. 2014, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 443, 969, aDS Bibcode: 2014MNRAS.443..969C
- Courbin, F., Chantry, V., Revaz, Y., et al. 2011, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 536, A53, publisher: EDP Sciences
- Dainotti, M. G., Simone, B. D., Schiavone, T., et al. 2021, The Astrophysical Journal, 912, 150, publisher: The American Astronomical Society
- Ding, X., Treu, T., Birrer, S., et al. 2021, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 503, 1096, arXiv:2006.08619 [astro-ph]
- Efstathiou, G. 2021, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 505, 3866, publisher: OUP ADS Bibcode: 2021MNRAS.505.3866E
- Etherington, A., Nightingale, J. W., Massey, R., et al. 2023, Strong gravitational lensing's 'external shear' is not shear, arXiv:2301.05244 [astro-ph]
- Faber, S. M. & Jackson, R. E. 1976, ApJ, 204, 668
- Falco, E. E., Gorenstein, M. V., & Shapiro, I. I. 1985, The Astrophysical Journal, 289, L1, aDS Bibcode: 1985ApJ...289L...1F
- Fassnacht, C. D., Gal, R. R., Lubin, L. M., et al. 2006, The Astrophysical Journal, 642, 30, arXiv:astro-ph/0510728
- Fassnacht, C. D., Koopmans, L. V. E., & Wong, K. C. 2011, MNRAS, 410, 2167
- Fassnacht, C. D., Pearson, T. J., Readhead, A. C. S., et al. 1999, The Astrophysical Journal, 527, 498, aDS Bibcode: 1999ApJ...527..498F
- Fassnacht, C. D., Xanthopoulos, E., Koopmans, L. V. E., & Rusin, D. 2002, The Astrophysical Journal, 581, 823, publisher: IOP Publishing
- Freedman, W. L., Madore, B. F., Hatt, D., et al. 2019, The Astrophysical Journal, 882, 34, arXiv:1907.05922 [astro-ph]
- Freedman, W. L., Madore, B. F., Hoyt, T., et al. 2020, The Astrophysical Journal, 891, 57, publisher: The American Astronomical Society
- Gilman, D., Birrer, S., & Treu, T. 2020, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 642, A194 Goldberg, D. M. & Bacon, D. J. 2005, ApJ, 619, 741
- Greene, Z. S., Suyu, S. H., Treu, T., et al. 2013, ApJ, 768, 39
- Hook, I. M., Jørgensen, I., Allington-Smith, J. R., et al. 2004, Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, 116, 425, publisher: IOP Publishing
- Keeton, C. R. 2003, The Astrophysical Journal, 584, 664, publisher: IOP Publishing

- Keeton, C. R. & Kochanek, C. S. 1997, The Astrophysical Journal, 487, 42, aDS Bibcode: 1997ApJ...487...42K
- Knabel, S., Treu, T., Cappellari, M., et al. 2024, Spatially Resolved Kinematics of SLACS Lens Galaxies. I: Data and Kinematic Classification, arXiv:2409.10631 [astro-ph]
- Knox, L. & Millea, M. 2020, Phys. Rev. D, 101, 043533
- Kochanek, C. S. 2002, The Astrophysical Journal, 578, 25, aDS Bibcode: 2002ApJ...578...25K
- Kochanek, C. S., Morgan, N. D., Falco, E. E., et al. 2006, The Astrophysical Journal, 640, 47, publisher: IOP Publishing
- Koopmans, L. V. E., Treu, T., Fassnacht, C. D., Blandford, R. D., & Surpi, G. 2003, The Astrophysical Journal, 599, 70, aDS Bibcode: 2003ApJ...599...70K
- Kovner, I. 1987, The Astrophysical Journal, 316, 52, aDS Bibcode: 1987ApJ...316...52K
- Mamon, G. A. & Lokas, E. L. 2005, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 363, 705, arXiv:astro-ph/0405491
- McCully, C., Keeton, C. R., Wong, K. C., & Zabludoff, A. I. 2014, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 443, 3631
- McCully, C., Keeton, C. R., Wong, K. C., & Zabludoff, A. I. 2017, The Astrophysical Journal, 836, 141, arXiv:1601.05417 [astro-ph]
- Merritt, D. 1985a, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 214, 25P, aDS Bibcode: 1985MNRAS.214P.25M
- Merritt, D. 1985b, The Astronomical Journal, 90, 1027, aDS Bibcode: 1985AJ.....90.1027M
- Michalewicz, K., Millon, M., Dux, F., & Courbin, F. 2023, Journal of Open Source Software, 8, 5340
- Millon, M., Courbin, F., Bonvin, V., et al. 2020, A&A, 640, A105
- Millon, M., Michalewicz, K., Dux, F., Courbin, F., & Marshall, P. J. 2024, Image deconvolution and PSF reconstruction with STARRED: a wavelet-based twochannel method optimized for light curve extraction
- Momcheva, I., Williams, K., Keeton, C., & Zabludoff, A. 2006, The Astrophysical Journal, 641, 169, publisher: IOP Publishing
- Momcheva, I. G., Williams, K. A., Cool, R. J., Keeton, C. R., & Zabludoff, A. I. 2015, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 219, 29, publisher: The American Astronomical Society
- Morgan, N. D., Caldwell, J. A. R., Schechter, P. L., et al. 2004, The Astronomical Journal, 127, 2617, arXiv:astro-ph/0312478
- Mortsell, E., Goobar, A., Johansson, J., & Dhawan, S. 2022, The Astrophysical Journal, 933, 212, arXiv:2105.11461 [astro-ph, physics:gr-qc]
- Oguri, M. 2007, The Astrophysical Journal, 660, 1, aDS Bibcode: 2007ApJ...660....1O
- Oguri, M. & Marshall, P. J. 2010, MNRAS, 405, 2579
- Osipkov, L. P. 1979, Soviet Astronomy Letters, 5, 42, aDS Bibcode: 1979SvAL....5...42O
- Refregier, A. 2003, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 338, 35, _eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1046/j.1365-8711.2003.05901.x
- Refsdal, S. 1964, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 128, 307, aDS Bibcode: 1964MNRAS.128..307R
- Riess, A. G., Casertano, S., Yuan, W., et al. 2021, The Astrophysical Journal, 908, L6, aDS Bibcode: 2021ApJ...908L...6R
- Riess, A. G., Casertano, S., Yuan, W., Macri, L. M., & Scolnic, D. 2019, The Astrophysical Journal, 876, 85, arXiv:1903.07603 [astro-ph]
- Riess, A. G., Yuan, W., Macri, L. M., et al. 2022, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 934, L7, arXiv:2112.04510 [astro-ph]
- Rusu, C. E., Wong, K. C., Bonvin, V., et al. 2020, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 498, 1440, arXiv:1905.09338 [astro-ph]
- Saha, P. 2000, The Astronomical Journal, 120, 1654, aDS Bibcode: 2000AJ....120.1654S
- Saha, P. & Williams, L. L. R. 2006, The Astrophysical Journal, 653, 936, aDS Bibcode: 2006ApJ...653..936S
- Schechter, P. L., Bailyn, C. D., Barr, R., et al. 1997, The Astrophysical Journal, 475, L85, publisher: IOP Publishing
- Schmidt, T., Treu, T., Birrer, S., et al. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2206.04696
- Schmidt, T., Treu, T., Birrer, S., et al. 2022, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 518, 1260, arXiv:2206.04696 [astro-ph]
- Schneider, P., Ehlers, J., & Falco, E. E. 1992, Gravitational Lenses, publication Title: Gravitational Lenses ADS Bibcode: 1992grle.book.....S
- Schneider, P. & Sluse, D. 2013, Astronomy and Astrophysics, 559, A37, aDS Bibcode: 2013A&A...559A..37S
- Schneider, P. & Sluse, D. 2014, Astronomy and Astrophysics, 564, A103, aDS Bibcode: 2014A&A...564A.103S
- Seljak, U. 1994, The Astrophysical Journal, 436, 509, aDS Bibcode: 1994ApJ...436..509S
- Shah, P., Lemos, P., & Lahav, O. 2021, Astronomy and Astrophysics Review, 29, 9, aDS Bibcode: 2021A&ARv..29....9S
- Shajib, A. J., Birrer, S., Treu, T., et al. 2019, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 483, 5649, arXiv:1807.09278 [astro-ph]
- Shajib, A. J., Mozumdar, P., Chen, G. C. F., et al. 2023, A&A, 673, A9

Article number, page 17 of 23

- Shajib, A. J., Mozumdar, P., Chen, G. C.-F., et al. 2023, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 673, A9, arXiv:2301.02656 [astro-ph]
- Shajib, A. J., Treu, T., & Agnello, A. 2018, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 473, 210, arXiv:1709.01517 [astro-ph]
- Shajib, A. J., Wong, K. C., Birrer, S., et al. 2022, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 667, A123, arXiv:2202.11101 [astro-ph]
- Shapiro, I. I. 1964, Phys. Rev. Lett., 13, 789
- Sluse, D., Hutsemékers, D., Courbin, F., Meylan, G., & Wambsganss, J. 2012, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 544, A62, arXiv:1206.0731 [astro-ph]
- Sluse, D., Rusu, C. E., Fassnacht, C. D., et al. 2019, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 490, 613
- Starck, J.-L., Moudden, Y., Abrial, P., & Nguyen, M. 2006, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 446, 1191, number: 3 Publisher: EDP Sciences
- Suyu, S. H., Auger, M. W., Hilbert, S., et al. 2013, ApJ, 766, 70
- Suyu, S. H., Chang, T.-C., Courbin, F., & Okumura, T. 2018, Space Science Reviews, 214, 91, arXiv:1801.07262 [astro-ph]
- Suyu, S. H. & Halkola, A. 2010, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 524, A94
- Suyu, S. H. & Halkola, A. 2010, A&A, 524, A94
- Suyu, S. H., Huber, S., Cañameras, R., et al. 2020, arXiv e-prints, 2002.08378
- Suyu, S. H., Marshall, P. J., Auger, M. W., et al. 2010a, ApJ, 711, 201
- Suyu, S. H., Marshall, P. J., Auger, M. W., et al. 2010b, The Astrophysical Journal, 711, 201, publisher: The American Astronomical Society
- Suyu, S. H., Treu, T., Hilbert, S., et al. 2014, The Astrophysical Journal, 788, L35, arXiv:1306.4732 [astro-ph]
- Sérsic, J. L. 1968, Atlas de Galaxias Australes, publication Title: Cordoba ADS Bibcode: 1968adga.book.....S
- Tan, C. Y., Shajib, A. J., Birrer, S., et al. 2024, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 530, 1474, arXiv:2311.09307 [astro-ph]
- Treu, T., Koopmans, L. V., Bolton, A. S., Burles, S., & Moustakas, L. A. 2006, ApJ, 640, 662
- Treu, T. & Koopmans, L. V. E. 2002, The Astrophysical Journal, 575, 87, publisher: IOP Publishing
- Treu, T. & Marshall, P. J. 2016, The Astronomy and Astrophysics Review, 24, 11, arXiv:1605.05333 [astro-ph]
- Treu, T., Suyu, S. H., & Marshall, P. J. 2022, The Astronomy and Astrophysics Review, 30, 8, arXiv:2210.15794 [astro-ph]
- Unruh, S., Schneider, P., & Sluse, D. 2017, Astronomy and Astrophysics, 601, A77, aDS Bibcode: 2017A&A...601A..77U
- Vanderriest, C., Schneider, J., Herpe, G., et al. 1989, Astronomy and Astrophysics, 215, 1, aDS Bibcode: 1989A&A...215....1V
- Verde, L., Treu, T., & Riess, A. G. 2019, Nature Astronomy, 3, 891, arXiv:1907.10625 [astro-ph, physics:gr-qc, physics:hep-ph, physics:hep-th]
- Wells, P., Fassnacht, C. D., & Rusu, C. E. 2023, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 676, A95
- Wells, P. R., Fassnacht, C. D., Birrer, S., & Williams, D. 2024a, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 689, A87, arXiv:2403.10666 [astro-ph]
- Wells, P. R., Fassnacht, C. D., Birrer, S., & Williams, D. 2024b, TDCOSMO XVI: Population Analysis of Lines of Sight of 25 Strong Galaxy-Galaxy Lenses with Extreme Value Statistics, arXiv:2403.10666 [astro-ph]
- Williams, K. A., Momcheva, I., Keeton, C. R., Zabludoff, A. I., & Lehár, J. 2006, The Astrophysical Journal, 646, 85
- Wilson, M. L., Zabludoff, A. I., Ammons, S. M., et al. 2016, The Astrophysical Journal, 833, 194, publisher: IOP ADS Bibcode: 2016ApJ...833..194W
- Wong, K. C., Keeton, C. R., Williams, K. A., Momcheva, I. G., & Zabludoff, A. I. 2010, The Astrophysical Journal, 726, 84, publisher: The American Astronomical Society
- Wong, K. C., Suyu, S. H., Auger, M. W., et al. 2017, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 465, 4895, arXiv:1607.01403 [astro-ph]
- Wong, K. C., Suyu, S. H., Chen, G. C.-F., et al. 2020, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 498, 1420, arXiv:1907.04869 [astro-ph]
- Wucknitz, O. 2002, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 332, 951, arXiv:astro-ph/0202376
- Yıldırım, A., Suyu, S. H., & Halkola, A. 2020, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 493, 4783, arXiv:1904.07237 [astro-ph]

Appendix A: Additional Systematic Tests

Appendix A.1: Polar Exponential Shapelet Bases

We tested representing our source complexity with polar exponential shapelet bases, which are theoretically expected to better encapsulate galaxy image information with fewer basis elements (Bergé et al. 2019). While our tests with polar exponential shapelets indeed yielded better BIC values, we found it came at the price of incorrect PSF reconstructions. This is likely caused by the increased information density near the origin of the shapelet model. This allowed for the extended source reconstruction to create point-source-like flux values at the center of the extended host's light distribution. This is problematic, as we need to accurately disentangle the light contributions from the point source and the extended source, otherwise our astrometry will be incorrect, biasing our results.

Therefore, despite the improved performance of polar exponential shapelets, we continue using the standard linear shapelets (e.g., H0LiCOW IX, Shajib et al. 2022). We find their spatiallyuniform information density effectively prevents them from overfitting the center of the extended quasar host galaxy light.

Appendix A.2: Two Extended Source Sérsics

All the source reconstructions from this system display a bulgelike component in the center of the host galaxy (see Fig. 5). This bulge may have preference for a distinct Sérsic index from the extended disk structure of the host, as we observe in nearby galaxies. Therefore, instead of reconstructing the source with one Sérsic light profile modified by linear shapelets, we attempted fitting an additional Sérsic profile (maintaining the same scale of linear shapelets). We explored both leaving the indices free and fixing them to typical locally observed values (one de Vaucouleurs profile at $n_{sérsic} = 4$ and one exponential profile at $n_{sérsic} = 1$). We found the BIC slightly, but consistently, preferred the simpler one-Sérsic extended source model.

Appendix A.3: Cutout Size

Although modeling larger cutouts aids in reconstructing the light profiles of the deflector and various perturbers, it comes at the cost of reduced weight on the extended source structure and drastic increases to computational time. To confirm the chosen mask sizes and positions (2.1" and 2.2" radii) compose a sufficient representation of the lens system, we fit one model on a significantly larger cutout and found no statistically significant discrepancies.

Appendix A.4: Fitting Likely Star-Forming Regions in Host

In addition, we attempted to add additional shapelets to account for the residuals found south west of image C. We found the additional computational cost outweighed the negligible affect on parameter constraints.

Appendix A.5: Scaling Deflector Einstein Radius with Perturbers

One possible modeling choice would be to scale the main deflector's Einstein radius with the rest of the galaxy-scale perturbers. We found it had negligible impact on the BIC and model results, but kept it free based on previous cosmography-grade lens models.

Appendix A.6: Modeling the F150W Band

Test models were run on the F150W band to verify the precision and accuracy of the results when moving to larger wavelengths. No significant discrepancies were found in the inferred parameters, including the Fermat potential differences.

Appendix A.7: Supersampling the Extended Source Light

As supersampling the data is computationally intensive, regions that are supersampled are typically confined to the centers of the point sources. To test for potential improvements on parameters like γ_{PEMD} , we ran tests that also supersampled a large portion of the extended light of the host. We found the computational trade-off outweighed the marginal gain on parameter precision.

Appendix A.8: Freeing Lens Light Sérsic Profiles

We found leaving the Sérsic indices free for the main deflector's light profiles led to an additional degeneracy with their resulting radii. This slowed model convergence, while having no notice-able impact on the resulting Fermat potential differences.

Appendix B: Model Weights

The model weights used for the final inference are shown in Table B.1. The models including flexion are weighted separately, as they are not used in the final inference.

Appendix C: Impact of PSF Noise Estimation

It is relatively challenging to estimate the additional uncertainty on the data caused by inaccuracies of the PSF model. However, as long as the residuals of the PSF are sufficiently amplified (without incorrectly amplifying the uncertainty of the extended source structure), this should have minimal impact on model results as shown in previous analyses (e.g., HOLiCOW XII).

The residuals of our models–after removing this additional PSF uncertainty in the data–showed no discernible trends that would raise concern (Fig. C.1). We also note minimal overlap between regions with amplified noise and the extended host structure, which proved a non-trivial task with JWST's PSF (Fig. C.2). This is crucial to avoid down weighting the ring structure of the extended source, which provides the tightest constraints on the power-law slope.

Appendix D: Tests on Source Reconstruction Supersampling

Given that this represents the most detailed source reconstruction ($n_{max} = 18, 20, 22$) among time-delay cosmography systems modeled with Lenstronomy, care must be taken to avoid supersampling beyond a numerically feasible limit. If the number of shapelets (or similarly, the shapelet scale) pass the threshold of information supported by the data, the model will be attempting to resolve spatial scales smaller than the data's pixel scale would constrain. This would lead to a nonphysical solution in the source light reconstruction, as the surface brightness of the source would no longer be conserved.

As we use linear shapelets for the parameterization of our source reconstruction, the minimum source scale reconstructed⁷

⁷ Technically, the "true" source scale depends on the spatiallydependent source plane magnification. However, this magnification al-

A&A proofs: manuscript no. main

Main Deflector	Source (Shapelet Order)	Perturbers	PSF Type	Mask (asec)	ΔBIC	Total Weight
		No Free Flexion				
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$18 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7	STARRED	2.2	38	1.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$20 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7	STARRED	2.2	96	0.483
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$20 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7	STARRED	2.1	190	0.094
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$18 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7	STARRED	2.1	195	0.084
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$22 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7	STARRED	2.2	303	0.005
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$22 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7	STARRED	2.1	410	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$18 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7	PSFr	2.2	1968	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$18 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7	PSFr	2.1	2014	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$20 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7	PSFr	2.2	2538	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$20 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7	PSFr	2.1	2164	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$22 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7	PSFr	2.1	2502	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$22 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7	PSFr	2.2	2379	0.000
		Free Flexion				
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$18 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7+Flexion	STARRED	2.1	0	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$18 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7+Flexion	STARRED	2.2	27	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$20 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7+Flexion	STARRED	2.1	63	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$20 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7+Flexion	STARRED	2.2	66	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$22 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7+Flexion	STARRED	2.2	226	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$22 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7+Flexion	STARRED	2.1	257	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$18 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7+Flexion	PSFr	2.1	1702	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$18 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7+Flexion	PSFr	2.2	1778	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$20 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7+Flexion	PSFr	2.2	1852	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$20 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7+Flexion	PSFr	2.1	2007	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$22 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7+Flexion	PSFr	2.2	2091	0.000
SPEMD + 2 SERSIC	$22 n_{\text{max}} + \text{SERSIC}$	X+G2+G3+G7+Flexion	PSFr	2.1	2218	0.000

Table B.1. Final models sorted by total weight (kinematics weight × modeling/BIC weight).

Notes. The weighting is separated between the flexion and non-flexion model families. The Δ BIC values are calculated relative to the best performing (lowest-BIC) model. For more information, see Sect. 6.1.

is given by

$$L_{\min} = \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{n_{\max} + 1}}.$$
 (D.1)

The shapelet scales reconstructed by our PSFr models were at $\beta_{\text{PSFr}} = 0.089^{+0.010}_{-0.005}$, while the STARRED models reconstructed at $\beta_{\text{STARRED}} = 0.074^{+0.006}_{-0.004}$ (STARRED model scales were on average 17% smaller than their PSFr counterparts). Ideally, this reconstruction scale should not be smaller than the spatial scale of our pixels, as this would imply that we are reconstructing at scales not constrained by the data. In other words, we require

$$L_{\min} \ge \delta_{\text{pix}},$$
 (D.2)

with our pixels in the drizzled F115W band having a spatial resolution of $\delta_{pix} \sim 0.0307$ arcsec /pix.

However, when supersampling the source, this form changes to reflect the increased source resolution assumed to be constrained by the supersampled data. For a supersampling factor of 3, the spatial scales in the image plane that constrain the source ray tracing are 3 times smaller than the true pixel scale of the data, yielding the new constraint

$$L_{\min} \ge \delta_{\text{pix}} / f_{\text{ss}},$$
 (D.3)

with our models taking a supersampling factor of $f_{ss} = 3$. This yields a minimum reconstruction scale allowed by the data of $L_{min} = 0.0103$, while the smallest value sampled by any of our models was $L_{min, model} = 0.0126$, still above the threshold for numerical stability.

ways increases the minimum allowed source scale. In this case, the analysis that follows applies even more strongly.

Appendix E: STARRED vs PSFr Parameter Comparison

Fig. E.1 shows cornerplots of the non-flexion models (as flexion was discarded for our results), comparing parameter posteriors for models using PSFr vs STARRED to generate their initial PSF. In the comparison, the two samples are completely split and assigned weights separately. STARRED had around eight models with significant weights, while PSFr had around three. Even though both PSFs were updated during the fitting, the disagreement in *initial* PSF leads to a more than $1-\sigma$ disagreement in parameters like the power-law slope, demonstrating the significance of accurate PSF modeling.



Fig. C.1. Without an additional correction for the uncertainty in the PSF, the fitting of the point sources drives the fit while providing little information (example is with STARRED PSF model). **Top left**: The noise map (or uncertainty in the data for each pixel) derived from the imaging data alone. **Top right**: Model normalized residuals without additionally accounting for PSF uncertainty. Large residuals near the image positions dominate the fit, while providing little information about the lens system. **Bottom left**: The noise map incorporating the additional uncertainty from PSF modeling, estimated by fitting stars in the field (Sect. 4.1). **Bottom right**: Model normalized residuals after including PSF uncertainty are more evenly distributed, allowing the models to focus on accurately describing the ring structure, which offers the strongest constraints on the mass slope, γ_{PEMD} —arguably the most critical parameter in power-law models.



Fig. C.2. Radial breakdown of image uncertainty contributions between the noise directly in the data and the additional PSF uncertainty term, showing the PSF contribution does not down-weight the ring structure of the extended source. **Top left**: normalized residual map, same as Fig. C.1. **Top middle left**: error contributions from the PSF uncertainty alone, and **top middle right** shows only the uncertainty due to the data alone. These are combined to form the final map, shown in Fig. C.1. **Top right**: the imaging data used for modeling, with circles indicating the largest radial extent of the images where the PSF uncertainty equals the noise uncertainty. Shown on the **bottom** are the radial uncertainty contributions from the imaging data vs the estimated PSF error. We find the maximum extent at which the PSF error dominates the uncertainty is at a radius less than 11 pixels ($\approx 0.338''$), shown in the top right figure.



Fig. E.1. Same as Fig. 7, except comparing weighted PSFr models to weighted STARRED models. Both groups receive BIC weights independently for this comparison.